

Applicant(s): Joseph W. Friepons et al.
Serial No.: 09/519,551
For: DISPLAY DEVICE
Filed: March 6, 2000
Examiner: A. Abdulsalam
Group Art Unit: 2674

PHN 17,326

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 10 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended.

The Action rejected claims 1 to 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,400 to Ueda et al. (hereinafter "the Ueda reference) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,851,709 to Grande et al. (hereinafter "the Grande reference").

It is respectfully submitted that present claims 1 through 10 are patentable over each of the cited references and/or the cited combination thereof.

With respect to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that, as stated in the Action, the Ueda reference at least fails to disclose or suggest "a laminar substrate with opposed sides, which opposed sides are both provided with electrically conducting patterns that are electrically through-connected via at least one opening in the laminar substrate, wherein said at least one opening is proximate said pixels." Applicants respectfully note that the Action, in an effort to address the deficiencies of the Ueda reference, cites the Grande reference contending that "substrate (100)", as defined therein, discloses the "laminar substrate", as defined by claim 1, and further that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to "modify Ueda's liquid crystal display system to ad[o]pt Grande's substrate (100) as arranged in Fig. 4D." (Office Action, page 2)

In response to the above noted assertion that, Applicants respectfully submit, that the Grande reference, like the Ueda reference does not disclose or suggest "a laminar substrate with opposed sides, which opposed sides are both provided with electrically conducting patterns that are electrically through-connected via at least one opening in the laminar substrate, wherein said at least one opening is proximate said pixels." Rather, in clear contrast, the Grand reference specifically teaches that Fig. 4D shows "in a schematic cross-sectional view, the method for selective transfer of a color organic layer...[via]...vaporization of the color forming organic donor layer previously disposed on the light

Applicant(s): Joseph W. Triepels et al.
Serial No.: 09/519,551
For: DISPLAY DEVICE
Filed: March 6, 2000
Examiner: A. Abdulselam
Group Art Unit: 2674

PHN 17,326

absorbing layer within the openings 114 in the substrate 100.” The Grande reference also teaches that the transfer of the color forming organic donor layer through the openings 114...provides a selectively transferred color organic layer 336 on designated pixels 332 of a device 300”. Still further, the Grande reference teaches that “after the selective transfer to designated subpixels of a device of one color (for example, a red color) ...donor layer residue is removed from the substrate...[and a]...donor layer capable of forming another color (for example, a green color) is then deposited on the substrate...[and]...[t]he device [300] is repositioned...with respect to the donor layer of such other color...[and the]...[s]elective transfer of this [second] donor layer to the designated subpixels of the device [300] then commences”. (col. 9, lines 23-25, 52-63).

Applicants respectfully submit that *selectively transferring* color forming layers from a substrate to designated pixels/subpixels of a distinct device, via *vaporization* and openings in the substrate is not the same as “a laminar substrate with opposed sides, which opposed sides are both provided with electrically conducting patterns that are electrically through-connected via at least one opening in the laminar substrate, wherein said at least one opening is proximate said pixels.” Hence, Applicants respectfully propose that neither the Grande reference nor the Ueda reference disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the stated rejection of claim 1, and allowance thereof, are respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 2 through 10, which either directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that each of these claims are patentable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 2 to 10, are respectfully requested.

In sum, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are patentable over each of the cited references and/or any proper combination thereof. Hence, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of all objections, and all rejections of the claims, are respectfully requested.

Applicant(s): Joseph W. Riepels et al.
Serial No.: 09/519,551
For: DISPLAY DEVICE
Filed: March 6, 2000
Examiner: A. Abdulselam
Group Art Unit: 2674

PHN 17,326

Dated: February 19, 2004



David L. Barnes, Esq.
Registration No. 47,407
Attorney for Applicant(s)
McCarter & English, LLP
Four Stamford Plaza
107 Elm Street
Stamford, CT 06902
Tel: (203) 324-1800
Fax: (203) 323-6513